

### **REMARKS**

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 3-4 and 9-18 are pending in this application. The foregoing amendment cancels Claims 1-2 and 5-8, amends Claims 3-4 to place the claims in independent form, and amends Claims 3-4, 9-11 and 13 in response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and the claim objections. The Examiner indicated that Claims 9 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Examiner further indicated that Claims 3-4, 10 and 12-18 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 1, 3, 9, 11 and 13 were objected to for certain informalities. The Applicant cancelled Claim 1 and amended Claims 3-4 (which include all of the limitations of cancelled Claim 1), 9 and 11 to correct grammatical errors. The Applicant also amended Claims 3 and 13 to put the symbol used for standard deviation in parenthesis.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Applicant amended Claims 3-4, 9 and 11 to clarify that “a first characteristic value fluctuating most of a characteristic” is a characteristic value of an element of the semiconductor device that fluctuates the most due to a fluctuation of a parameter of the element.

The Applicant amended Claims 3-4 to clarify that “a width of the fluctuation of the parameter” is a width of the fluctuation of the parameter of the element.

The Applicant amended Claim 9 to clarify that “the characteristic” described in line 7 of the original Claim 9 is the characteristic of the element, rather than the circuit characteristic described in line 11 of the original Claim 9.

The Applicant amended Claim 11 to clarify that “the parameter” described in lines 4 and 11 is the parameter of the element.

Although the Examiner noted that the limitation “the element” in lines 3 and 5 has insufficient antecedent basis, the Applicant submits that there was an antecedent basis “an element” in line 2 of the original Claim 1.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and Claims 5-6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Since Claims 1-2 and 5-8 are now cancelled, these rejections are moot upon cancellation of these claims.

**CONCLUSION**

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. This application should now be in condition for allowance, and the Applicant solicits a notice to that effect. If there are any issues that can be addressed by telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned at 404.685.6799.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Brenda O. Holmes  
Reg. No. 40,339

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP  
Suite 2800, 1100 Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530  
Our Docket: 44471-264230